

**IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE**

Inventor(s):	Michael S. Allison et al.	Confirmation No:	9960
Serial No.:	09/917,377	Examiner:	Khanh B. Pham
Filing Date:	07/28/2001	Group Art Unit:	2166
Title:	METHOD FOR PROCESSING EVENTS FROM ELECTRONIC ARCHITECTURE		

**Mailstop: Appeal Brief - Patents  
Commissioner for Patents  
P. O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450**

**REPLY BRIEF**

**Introductory Comments**

In response to the Examiner's Answer dated October 11, 2007 (hereinafter "the Examiner's Answer"), please consider the following remarks.

## **Remarks**

### *Claims 1-7 and 9-20*

The Examiner's Answer indicates that U.S. Patent No. 6,598,179 to Chirashnya et al. (hereinafter "Chirashnya") "teaches at Col. 12 lines 5-20 ... the step of analyzing "Result Number" to provide a human interpretable statement. For example, the "Result Number" R1 is analyzed using table IV for corresponding Message Number 10, the catalog file is then consulted to provide a human interpretable statement "The Communication Adapter is damaged and needs to be replaced." (Page 12 of the Examiner's Answer.)

The Appellant respectfully disagrees with this characterization of Chirashnya. As discussed in the Appeal Brief of July 5, 2007 (hereinafter "the Appeal Brief"), Chirashnya indicates specifically with respect to Table IV that the first column (containing the entries denoted R1 and R2) is "the *entry number* (i.e., the corresponding *Result\_Num*)..." (Column 11, lines 64 and 65; emphasis supplied.) Chirashnya further discloses pseudocode equating the variable Result with Result\_Num. (See "Result = Result\_Num" several times within Table III, found at column 10, line 37.) In addition, the specific examples listed beginning at column 10, line 53, all show the Result variable representing an *integer, not a text string*. (See "Result = 1" at column 10, line 54, "Result = 3" at column 10, line 59, "Result = 5" at column 11, line 2, and "Result = 1" at column 11, line 3.) Since Result is an integer, and Result is equated with a Result Number, the Result Number must always be an integer, *not* a text string; otherwise, a data-type conflict would result.

In response, the Examiner's Answer asserts that "R1, R2, by definition, are text strings." (Page 13 of the Examiner's Answer.) The Appellant respectfully disagrees. At no point does Chirashnya refer to the result number, denoted by R1, R2 in Table IV, as a text string, but only as a number. The use of the letter "R" before the result numbers 1 and 2 in Table IV likely helps to distinguish the "Result Number" column from the "Message Number" and "Report FRU" columns (R likely indicating "result"). In fact,

the designations R1 and R2 are likely used in Table IV instead of explicit integers so that specific integer values (such as 1 and 2) are not associated with the specific catalog file examples shown at column 12, lines 17-19. In addition, if a textual “R” were actually used as part of *every* Result Number, the “R” would not help distinguish one result number from another, thus making the use of a text string worthless in that situation. Moreover, the Result values above would not be merely integers, such as 1, 3, 5, and so on, but would also include a text-format value (such as ASCII) for the letter “R” (e.g., the hexadecimal number 52H). The only strings actually discussed in Chirashnya are those relating to the user messages apparently employed in the Examiner’s Answer as the “human interpretable statement” of claim 1.

The Examiner’s Answer further indicates that “[t]he characters “1”, “3”, “5” are not [necessarily] integers, because they can be text string[s] as well. Characters 0-9 are represented in the well-known ASCII table ... by Decimal values 48-57, which indicates that characters 0-9 are text string[s].” (Page 13 of the Examiner’s answer.) Again, the Appellant respectfully disagrees. Chirashnya does not indicate that any of the numbers referred to therein are actually text strings. The same is true of the pseudocode of Chirashnya. In software and pseudocode, text strings typically are denoted by surrounding the string by single- or double-quotes, such as the catalog file examples of column 12, lines 17-19. Instead, each instance of the variables Result and Result\_Num referred to above is equated with a number without surrounding quotes, indicating that the number is an integer, not a text string. Further, other variables, such as EventCount and TimeFrame from Table III, are also equated with integers in the same fashion as the Result variable, and Chirashnya does not indicate that any of these variables are text strings, but instead denote and signify integers.

Thus, based on the foregoing, the Appellant respectfully contends that Chirashnya does not teach or suggest *text strings* being analyzed to provide a human interpretable statement, as provided for in claims 1 and 18. Therefore, the Appellant asserts that claims 1 and 18 are allowable, and such indication is respectfully requested.

Claims 2-7 and 9-17 depend from independent claim 1, and claims 19 and 20 depend from independent claim 18, thus incorporating the provisions of their associated

independent claims. Thus, the Appellant asserts that claims 2-7, 9-17, 19 and 20 are allowable for at least the reasons presented above in support of claims 1 and 18, and such indication is respectfully requested.

### *Further Regarding Claim 13*

The Examiner's Answer indicates that by way of a reference to paragraph [0020] of the present application in relation to claim 13 in the "Summary of Claimed Subject Matter" of the Appeal Brief, that "'updating command line options automatically' means that command line options are inputted automatically from the configuration file, without requiring [a] user to enter each option to the command line, wherein the commands are Telnet commands." (Page 14 of the Examiner's Answer.) The Appellant respectfully disagrees, and contends that the Examiner's Answer unnecessarily limits the phrase "updating command line options automatically" in claim 13 when read in light of the current specification. For example, the references to configuration files and Telnet commands are particular embodiments of claim 13 employed in the current specification, and are not specifically recited in claim 13.

Further regarding claim 13, the Examiner's Answer asserts that U.S. Patent No. 6,269,398 to Leong et al. (hereinafter "Leong") "describes at Col. 13 line 65 to Col. 14 line 5 an embodiment which provides for the ability of the network administrator to create and automate execution of complex Telnet commands by assigning Telnet commands to buttons in the menu: 'The Telnet Commands may then be added as buttons in the various pop-up menus in the router network management system.' Selecting a button will automatically updat[e] command line options with new Telnet command. (See Col. 14 lines 40-50.)" (Page 14 of the Examiner's Answer.)

The Appellant respectfully disagrees with this characterization of Leong. Claim 13 provides that a step of controlling one or more steps of extracting, separating and transforming via one or more command line options comprises *updating the command line options automatically from the electronic architecture*. The passage of Leong at column 13, line 65, to column 14, line 5, cited in the Examiner's Answer, indicates that the network administrator actually creates the individual Telnet commands which are

later executed by way of a menu button selection. Leong further provides at column 14, lines 40-50, (also cited in the Examiner's Answer) an example of an actual Telnet command ("sh ip traffic") that is executable via a menu button. Such capability does not teach or suggest *updating command line options* at all, much less updating these options automatically from the architecture. As a result, the Appellant contends that claim 13 is allowable for at least this additional reason, and such indication is respectfully requested.

### **Conclusion**

In light of the foregoing remarks, the Appellant contends that the final rejections of claims 1-7 and 9-20 are erroneous, and respectfully requests its reversal.

The Appellant believes that no fees are due with respect to this filing. However, should the Office determine that additional fees are necessary, the Office is hereby authorized to charge Deposit Account No. 08-2025.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: December 5, 2007

/Kyle J. Way/

Kyle J. Way, Reg. No. 45,549  
Setter Roche LLP  
Telephone: (720) 562-2280  
E-mail: kyle@setterroche.com

**Correspondence address:**

**CUSTOMER NO. 022879**

HEWLETT-PACKARD COMPANY  
Intellectual Property Administration  
P.O. Box 272400  
Fort Collins, CO 80527-2400